

UNDERSTANDING LEADERSHIP

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL PHILIP W. STANLEY
United States Army

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:

Approved for Public Release.
Distribution is Unlimited.

USAWC CLASS OF 2011

This SRP is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.



U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013-5050

The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle State Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
<small>Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.</small>					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 16-02-2011		2. REPORT TYPE Strategy Research Project		3. DATES COVERED (From - To)	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Understanding Leadership				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Lieutenant Colonel Philip W. Stanley				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Colonel Deborah L. Hanagan Department of National Security and Strategy				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army War College 122 Forbes Avenue Carlisle, PA 17013				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Distribution A: Unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT The purpose of this paper is to examine accepted U.S. leadership theories and connect these age old theories to what the Army believes is needed in the 21 st century Army leader. The paper will go beyond the question of whether a leader is born or made by suggesting that from America's research on the topic, there are key areas that can be affected to develop good leaders regardless of their innate leadership gifts. The end result of this paper is to strip away some of the mystique of leadership and find the practices at the root of how one influences others to achieve an objective. The paper will show that, after examination of several of the major theories, one can clearly see the Army is moving along with contemporary trends, while maintaining a legacy of commitment to past generational theories. Finally, the paper argues that role competency is the most practical approach for officer development, and that the role of most officers is that of a manager. To have great competency in one's primary role will subsequently make it possible to function as an effective leader.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Trait Theory, Behavior Theory, Situation Theory, Transformational Leadership, Leader, Manager					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UNLIMITED	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 28	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	b. ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	c. THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area code)

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

UNDERSTANDING LEADERSHIP

by

Lieutenant Colonel Philip W. Stanley
United States Army

Colonel Deborah L. Hanagan
Project Adviser

This SRP is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Lieutenant Colonel Philip W. Stanley
TITLE: Understanding Leadership
FORMAT: Strategy Research Project
DATE: 16 Feb 2011 WORD COUNT: 5,973 PAGES: 28
KEY TERMS: Trait Theory, Behavior Theory, Situation Theory, Transformational Leadership, Leader, Manager
CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The purpose of this paper is to examine accepted U.S. leadership theories and connect these age old theories to what the Army believes is needed in the 21st century Army leader. The paper will go beyond the question of whether a leader is born or made by suggesting that from America's research on the topic, there are key areas that can be affected to develop good leaders regardless of their innate leadership gifts. The end result of this paper is to strip away some of the mystique of leadership and find the practices at the root of how one influences others to achieve an objective. The paper will show that, after examination of several of the major theories, one can clearly see the Army is moving along with contemporary trends, while maintaining a legacy of commitment to past generational theories. Finally, the paper argues that role competency is the most practical approach for officer development, and that the role of most officers is that of a manager. To have great competency in one's primary role will subsequently make it possible to function as an effective leader.

UNDERSTANDING LEADERSHIP

Studies show that leadership matters a great deal and makes a difference in the success or failure of an organization. As one scholar put it, “In the beginning is the leadership act. A leaderless movement is naturally out of the question.”¹ Sun Tzu wrote, “The leader of armies is the arbiter of the peoples’ fate, and the man on whom it depends whether the nation shall be in peace or in peril.”² This extreme description of the role of leader clearly shows the importance of the duty. Perhaps because so much is riding on good leadership, there have been volumes written about it, so when approaching the topic of leadership, one will quickly become overwhelmed with the vast amount of information and competing theories. There are thousands of studies, journals, and books on the subject; and this is true even when narrowing the topic to only Western philosophies. The *Handbook of Leadership* by Bernard M. Bass cites over three thousand studies.³ To narrow the topic further one may look to his specific profession and determine the best model to follow. For the Army, that reference is *Field Manual 6-22, Army Leadership*, and the new emerging publication from the Army’s Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) entitled “The Army Leader Development Strategy” (ALDS). If one narrows the subject to just these two documents the topic is more manageable, yet still comprehensive. However, how did the Army arrive at the selected attributes that are listed in these documents? Can they be traced back to leadership theories found in society at large, or does the military live within its own sub-culture and derive theories independent of the wider culture?

The purpose of this paper is to examine accepted U.S. leadership theories and connect these age old theories to what the Army believes is needed in the 21st century

Army leader. The paper will go beyond the question of whether a leader is born or made by suggesting that from America's research on the topic, there are key areas that can be affected to develop good leaders regardless of their innate leadership gifts. The end result of this paper is to strip away some of the mystique of leadership and find the practices at the root of how one influences others to achieve an objective. The paper will show that, after examination of several of the major theories, one can clearly see the Army is moving along with contemporary trends, while maintaining a legacy of commitment to past generational theories. Finally, the paper argues that role competency is the most practical approach for officer development, and that the role of most officers is that of a manager. To have great competency in one's primary role will subsequently make it possible to function as an effective leader.

In pursuit of this objective, this paper will examine four areas that can impact on the effectiveness of 21st century leaders. First, it is important to look at the operating environment in order to frame the role of the Army leader. This is necessary because there are many kinds of valuable leaders, such as teachers, scientists, and businessmen, but they usually do not have the same set of issues as military leaders, and therefore do not require the same set of skills. Next, the paper will examine definitions of leadership, it will review the classic leadership theories and it will track their influence on current Army leadership theory. The paper will then review some of the impediments to achieving the goal of good leadership. Finally, this paper will suggest practical development areas and review whether or not the Army is currently addressing these aspects of leadership development.

Characterizing the 21st Century Environment

“At the intersection of globalization, environmental calamity, resource scarcity, demographic strain, and international political-military competition lies a complex interconnected future that will be filled with persistent conflict and instability.”⁴ The Army officer is expected to coordinate and manage information in a Joint, Interagency, Intergovernmental, Multinational (JIIM) environment, which requires skills that include working within bureaucratic structures and the understanding of organizational policies and procedures. The environment is described as fast paced, requiring mental agility to transition from one operation or task to another quickly. In the “Leader Development Strategy for a 21st Century Army,” soldiers and officers are reminded that “we must learn faster, understand better, and adapt more rapidly” in this environment.⁵ To function effectively and quickly requires advanced skills in planning, organizing, staffing, directing, and controlling; and using human, financial, and material resources.

In the social environment, future leaders will not act in a homogeneous setting, nor will they always lead men and women of their own generation, value system, or national origin. Leaders must contend with new technologies and changing attitudes about combat and its effects on people, resources, and the environment. Leaders will have to be aware of cultural norms and know what society will allow of a leader.

Military organizations have typically believed in strong, demanding, results driven leaders, but as demographics change and international partnerships emerge, leadership approaches may require adjustments. Traditionally, Western culture has written about military leaders by directly or tacitly acknowledging that armies have been led in patriarchal environments, where there was a level of inequality between leaders and

followers, and views of gender roles that favor men.⁶ The future leader will find a different demographic and social environment, which is made up of “cross-national” transfers and societies that continue to advance gender and sexual preference equality. The new environment calls for partnering with cultures that lead in different ways, some are more democratic and some more authoritarian.⁷ As U.S. Army officers take on an expanded role in international partnerships, the social environment has to be understood in terms of the complex factors required to lead organizations from various cultures, which includes an understanding of other histories, religions, and languages.⁸

Leadership Theories

With the operational environment in mind, one must consider the foundations of the American philosophy of leadership, which directly influence military leadership practices, and then look at how it may be evolving to meet the demands of the future. In fact, there are few theories the Army has not adopted over time, and which are embodied in Army publications, the most comprehensive being FM 6-22. This field manual encapsulates nearly all generations of leadership theory, as this paper will illustrate.

American leadership can be understood by looking at U.S. Army and business definitions of leadership. There is no doubt that the United States of America puts a premium on leaders, and with good reason. Since time has been recorded, leadership in military organizations has emphasized that better-led forces are repeatedly victorious over poorly-led forces.⁹ Therefore, in America’s Army there is little doubt that leadership must be a core competency of an officer. The newest version of Army Field Manual (FM) 6-22 defines leadership this way: “...anyone who by virtue of assumed role or

assigned responsibility inspires and influences people to accomplish organizational goals. Army leaders motivate people both inside and outside the chain of command to pursue actions, focus thinking, and shape decisions for the greater good of the organization.”¹⁰ There is no single definition of leadership outside the military. Educators, preachers, and civil servants all have their ideas and definitions of leadership. The business industry seems to use more comparisons to the military environment to characterize its profession, but even it characterizes strategic leadership with a slightly different emphasis—an emphasis the Army would do well to integrate into its leadership equation. Business emphasizes management skills, which the Army seems to avoid. One of the better business descriptions highlights the process of getting activities completed efficiently “with and through other people.”¹¹ It goes on to identify the process of setting and achieving goals through “five basic management functions: planning, organizing, staffing, directing, and controlling; by utilizing human, financial, and material resources.”¹² On the face of it, one can argue the Army could also use this definition to describe what commanders and staff officers do on a day to day basis.

To get a feel for where these definitions evolved, this paper will examine leadership theories from recent times. In about the last eighty years, there have been four major areas of studies concerning leadership. These theories are commonly referred to as “classical theories”¹³ and include trait theories, behavioral theories, contingency theories, and transformational theories. However, it is worth noting that none of these successive generations of theories are exclusive of the other. As John van Maurik explains:

Although it is true that the progression of thinking tends to follow a sequential path, it is quite possible for elements of one generation to crop

up much later in the writings of someone who would not normally think to himself or herself as being of that school. Consequently, it is fair to say that each generation has added something to the overall debate on leadership and that the debate continues.¹⁴

With Maurik's point in mind, it is even more valuable to examine these theories because it is likely that whatever new ideas emerge, they will be influenced by these classical models.

Until shortly after World War II, nearly all Western theory focused on "traits," such as "trustworthiness" to explain success.¹⁵ The theory came on the heels of theories such as "great man" theory which suggested that the capacity for leadership is inherent – that great leaders are born, not made. Trait theory is closely related to great man theory, but instead of relying on genetic causes, it contends that genetics do not fully explain why some people have successes. Trait theory espouses certain identifiable character qualities that determine success.¹⁶ This theory has a couple of challenges, namely that studies have shown that there is not a great deal of difference between traits of leaders and followers, and that people who possess the traits may even be less successful.¹⁷ Secondly, simply having these traits does not mean people will be universally successful in all situations. In other words, the idea a person with the traits would be successful in any situation, be it the battlefield, classroom, or boardroom, does not necessarily hold true.¹⁸ More recently there have been studies that look at situational leadership as it applies to traits. This approach appears to have more acceptability because it lists certain traits for certain situations rather than assuming a single list of characteristics will always usher in success.¹⁹ The significance of trait theory to military officers is that FM 6-22 relies heavily on these types of lists. A review of commonly accepted traits from this theory includes:

- Physical vitality and stamina.
- Intelligence and action-oriented judgment.
- Eagerness to accept responsibility.
- Task competence.
- Understanding of followers and their needs.
- Skill in dealing with people.
- Need for achievement.
- Capacity to motivate people.
- Courage and resolution.
- Trustworthiness.
- Decisiveness.
- Self-confidence.
- Assertiveness.
- Adaptability/flexibility.²⁰

It quickly becomes obvious by scanning the contents page of FM 6-22 that the Army maintains that certain traits are required for success. The traits listed above can be found, sometimes using different terms, throughout Army publications, especially FM 6-22. The FM also provides examples of great leaders who succeeded by using the traits outlined in the FM. This approach harkens back to some of the “great man” theories, so it is clear that while trait theory is one of the oldest theories of modern research, it is still very much a part of the current Army culture.

The next generation of theory focused on “behaviors” of leaders and followers. It took root as early as 1929, but did not become popular for another twenty years.²¹ This

theory takes the opposite approach of “great man” and to some degree trait theory. It proposes that leadership is learned behavior and is not a born quality. It portends that leadership depends more on how officers and managers behave toward followers and that it is possible to teach people how they should act. It is more difficult to find direct correlation of this theory to common Army documents, but the influence and practice of it was unmistakably the most widely applied form of leadership practiced in the Army prior to and during the Cold War. It is arguably still the most practiced form of leadership today. Management theories (also known as "transactional theories") fall into this category and focus on the role of supervision, organization, and group performance. This theory bases leadership on a system of rewards and punishments. Managerial theories also use these concepts in business: when employees are successful, they are rewarded; when they fail, they are punished in some way. The main thrust of this research has been on the observable behaviors of the leaders and how it changed the behavior of subordinates.²² Evidence of how this theory is translated in the Army is how it diligently plies soldiers with medals for good conduct and uses the Uniform Code of Military Justice to punish poor conduct. This form of leadership emphasizes the impact of making the receipt of reward or the avoidance of punishment contingent on the subordinate behaving as required.

It is more common today to use this theory to understand how followers will react to leaders' behaviors. The following list identifies some of the behavior areas into which leaders fall:

- Concern for task (which is sometimes identified as conflicting with the next category).

- Concern for people.
- Directive leadership (which is usually identified as the opposite of the next category).
- Participative leadership.²³

The next broad category from which military application can find its roots is “situational” theory. Researchers viewed situations along a spectrum; some proposed that leadership is usually a product of circumstances. Military literature recounts stories about heroes that in some cases become mythical figures (recall “great man” theory). FM 6-22 is replete with stories of people who rose to lead based on the situation in which they found themselves. Other researchers focused on the styles leaders can employ based on their situation.²⁴ From this initial theory, researchers developed the “contingency” approach which identifies three categories of how a leader responds in a given environment:

- The structure of the task, which proposes that leaders will enjoy the support of followers if they clearly spell out goals, methods, and standards of performance.
- The position of power, which relates to the authority given to the leader that increases his or her influence.
- The relationship between the leader and the followers, which argues that when a leader is “liked” and “respected,” because of the leader’s personal attention to the follower, they are more likely to be effective.

The Army also employs this approach to leadership. In chapter one of FM 6-22, the manual states that leaders are responsible for providing direction for completion of

tasks by “providing clear direction involves communicating how to accomplish a mission: prioritizing tasks, assigning responsibility for completion, and ensuring subordinates understand the standard.” Later in the manual, in regard to position of power, it refers to the “...freedom to modify plans and orders...to adapt to changing circumstances. In relations between leader and follower, the manual’s Appendix B describes adaptive approaches to counseling.”²⁵ These are only a few examples of how the Army applies the situational approach to leadership. The Army Training and Doctrine Command’s (TRADOC) recent “Leader Development Strategy for a 21st Century Army” repeatedly emphasizes that leaders must adapt their styles, methods and techniques to the situation at hand.²⁶

Finally, the last theory this paper reviews is transformational theories. In some ways, this theory is similar to behavioral theory in that it looks at the reactions of followers to leaders. However, the focus differs in that reward and punishment is not the motivational goal. Instead, the focal point is on positive motivation; more specifically, on the connections formed between leaders and followers. Transformational leaders motivate and inspire people by helping group members see the importance and higher good of a task. These leaders are focused on the performance of group members, but also want each person to fulfill his or her potential. Leaders with this style often have high ethical and moral standards.²⁷ Members of the Army repeatedly demonstrate this approach. From the oath taken upon initial entry into service, to the stories of conquests that save the nation, soldiers and officers invoke the higher calling of the mission to which they are called.

In FM 6-22, this practice is referred to as “Influence Techniques.” The manual states that “influence is the essential element of leadership” and it refers to the “ways in which one person’s messages, behaviors, and attitudes effects the intentions, beliefs, behaviors and attitudes of another...”²⁸ An example of a transformational leader was given by General of the Army George C. Marshall during a speech to officer candidates in 1941, where he identified the elements of leadership that will illicit the right behavioral response of followers, but in a positive manner.

When you are commanding, leading [Soldiers] under conditions where physical exhaustion and privations must be ignored; where the lives of [Soldiers] may be sacrificed, then, the efficiency of your leadership will depend only to a minor degree on your tactical or technical ability. It will primarily be determined by your character, your reputation, not so much for courage—which will be accepted as a matter of course—but by the previous reputation you have established for fairness, for that high-minded patriotic purpose, that quality of unswerving determination to carry through any military task assigned you.²⁹

It is unfortunately in this theory that some have further linked transformational concepts with traits or characteristics that have no relation to the premises of transformational theory and that are not backed with solid evidence. Such ideas as genetic predisposition, or physical attributes such as height and good looks, or charming personality have become viewed as causes of effective leadership. Research shows these qualities in themselves have mixed effect on leadership effectiveness at best³⁰ and may actually have no effect or even negative effect in some cases.³¹ When compared to other measures of leadership, such as role competency and empathy for others, one finds that appearance and charisma have less reliability when measuring for positive causes of leadership.³²

Impediments to the Goal of Good Leadership

There are numerous impediments to identifying the root of good leadership, because, as mentioned elsewhere in this paper, myths about great men, genetic inheritance, God-given charisma, and so forth, have endured and filled Army stories for years. This paper has illustrated that the various classical theories positively inform the Army profession, and provide a rich narrative of the character of those who have served in the past. In FM 6-22, and elsewhere in military publications, one may find numerous examples of the leadership theories described in this paper. Soldiers will also find information specific to their job, or role, and will be informed he or she must be competent in that role. However, the classical theories do not discuss the importance, and perhaps even the primacy, a given role plays in being an effective leader. This paper argues that if one can fully understand, and then master, the role he has been assigned, then becoming an effective leader is more likely. For the average Army officer the role assigned is that of a “manager.” If the role of manager can be better understood, the function of leadership may become less ambiguous, and self development will be more obvious and practical.

A small example, which makes the point that leadership principles are often difficult to grasp, is found in a blog entry from a 101st Airborne Division soldier, which proposed that leadership resembles the descriptions of war provided by Clausewitz. The [blog’s] author quotes material used at the Army War College and, while not directly stated, the inference one could take from the comments is that the theory and study of leadership can be compared to the fog of war.³³ The author cleverly suggested replacing the word “war” with “leadership” in one of Clausewitz’s famous observations.

By following this suggestion one starts to get a sense of the complexity that exists when trying to understand how to become a good leader:

They aim at fixed values; but in [leadership] everything is uncertain, and calculations have to be made with variable quantities. They direct the inquiry exclusively toward physical quantities, whereas all military action is intertwined with psychological forces and effects. They consider only unilateral action, whereas [leadership] consists of a continuous interaction of opposites.³⁴

In attempting to make the meaning of leadership less unclear, it is necessary to better understand the meaning of roles and functions, and to understand that before a person can “function” as a leader, he or she must master the skills required of the “role” he is assigned. This paper has suggested that the role of a typical Army officer is that of a “manager.” By combining the earlier definitions of leadership from FM 6-22 with one of the accepted business definitions, it becomes obvious that military and business managers share many of the same tasks and leader requirements. Therefore, one can say the Army employs managers who are leaders based on their roles, functions, and authorities. This paper will refer to this position as the “manager-leader.”

FM 6-22 has many examples that describe the management of processes and systems, which require extensive management skills, but never directly acknowledges that Army leaders are managers of organizations and process,³⁵ other than to encourage leaders to self-educate by taking management courses. Perhaps the main impediment is the view often held of what a manager is. In the Army, and many other organizations, people frequently talk about the differences between a “manager” and a “leader” as if they were separate people. Leaders are often described as visionary, social, creative, and able to communicate in a wide circle of people and situations. However, the description of a manager is of one who is comfortable with the mundane,

or the dull and tedious routine of daily work. Unfortunately, this separation between “manager” and “leader” has caused many to debase the role of the manager. Managers are viewed as oppressive and authoritative “bosses” who coerce and micro-manage their subordinates. However, there is no evidence to support this opinion.³⁶ Because the Army barely, if ever, mentions the role of manager, it implicitly advances this notion.

The significance of splicing out the role of manager, and understanding the specifics of the role in large complex organizations and environments, is to acknowledge that there is no “leader” task that does not require the competency of a manager to manipulate the processes to achieve the desired goal. The danger in overlooking the leader’s role as a manager is that one may overly depend on personality traits to carry the burden of leadership rather than the proficient employment of skills.³⁷ Another reason to study management in the context of leadership is the trend toward believing that somehow a person can be a good leader without being a good manager first. This tendency to separate the “manager” from the “leader” is a reason the concept of a manager is debased in many circles, and also creates a “powerful confusion and vagueness about the meaning both of leadership and of managing.”³⁸ Another reason to concentrate efforts on being an effective manager-leader is that officers, more often than not, function in staff roles which are consumed with bureaucratic processes. The most important reason for making the connection between leader and manager is that it “demystifies” what it means to be and how to become a good and effective leader.³⁹ Many officers are left with the idea that a good leader possesses unique, even God-given,⁴⁰ traits that somehow separates those who lead

and those who do not. This paper thus argues that good leadership is derived from competency and not exceptional behavior or inherent traits.

Recommendations for the Development of Army Leaders

To fully address the role of an Army officer in the 21st century, it is appropriate to look both within and outside military organizations for examples. The Army culture is understandably all about “leadership,” but as Elliott Jaques and Stephen Clement argue, one should first understand that there are no “free-standing leadership roles.”⁴¹ Leadership happens within the confines of established role relationships that are constructed for different reasons, such as social positions in the case of community leaders, or accountability in the case of an organizational leader. A person serves in a position which requires some leadership to do the job. For example, a teacher, preacher, commander, or manager firstly teaches, preaches, commands or manages, but they are also responsible for influencing others to move toward a particular goal, and it is this second part that makes a person a leader. The point to be made is that leadership is not the role; it is a characteristic of a role. Therefore, one must first understand and be skillful in his role before he is able to effectively lead. Role competency is the most practical approach for officer leadership development.

Because leadership does not stand in isolation from other skills, the expectation is that one must be competent in the primary role first. Elliott Jaques, in his book *Executive Leadership*, argues that it is this other competency that allows a person to become a leader in the first place. Essentially, he says that people are happy to follow a person who is “extraordinarily competent” [in his or her role] and these “feelings” further produces feelings that they identify with a leader.

It is an almost mystical feeling, of everyone's being at one with everyone else. In other words, under circumstances where we have a person exercising great competence in a role with leadership accountability, the effect is to bind people together; the binding together touches the deep recesses of our values for social cohesion, and we are suffused by warm feeling that we tend to associate, incorrectly, with personal qualities in our leaders rather than with effective competence."⁴²

Soldiers reinforce this perspective since they invariably emphasize that what they most desire in superiors is confidence in the superiors' abilities. General of the Army Omar Bradley said, "The American soldier is a proud one and he demands professional competence in his leaders. In battle, he wants to know that the job is going to be done right, with no unnecessary casualties."⁴³ Stephen Zaccaro places emphasis on competency in terms of "cognitive intelligence" and "cognitive reasoning" and the possession of strong conceptual skills. This trait may take on many forms which include the ability to deal with complex thinking, nimbleness in conceptualizing the environment, and the ability to build consensus with diverse groups.⁴⁴

A fundamental aspect of leadership is the perception created from competence, which reminds us that leadership occurs in "human minds;" it occurs in the mind of the leader and the mind of the followers. Martin Chemers, describes leadership as the "process of social influence in which one person can enlist the aid and support of others in the accomplishment of a common task."⁴⁵ Therefore, one can conclude that one of the key aspects of leadership is not the possession of some phenomenal, or unexplainable trait, rather it is the power that emerges from a person acting with great competence within his given role. Another way of understanding the concept is to look at other kinds of leaders, such as Albert Einstein. Even though he possessed few of the traits found in FM 6-22 (and therefore would probably not make a great military leader)

he was widely viewed as a leader because he was extraordinarily competent in physics.⁴⁶

The final area of this paper concerns three aspects of the manager-leader role which need to be developed. The aspects are stamina, social intelligence, and mental agility. These areas of management are often criticized and attributed to transactional models, which is not viewed positively as a description of leadership.⁴⁷ The Army recognizes the importance of all three of these aspects. Field Manual 6-22 lists a dozen leader attributes, which includes such things as fitness, resiliency, mental agility, innovation, and interpersonal tact.⁴⁸ This paper highlights these three aspects because they are often not associated with the idea of “manager,” but more importantly, these attributes are common to business and military.

Stamina is defined as the enduring physical or mental energy and strength that allows somebody to do something for a long time.⁴⁹ Montgomery Meigs put it this way: “Influencing the battle with one’s presence remains a crucial aspect of generalship to this day.”⁵⁰ Meigs also used a Civil War battle to give an example of leaders with “energy,” when he described the second day of the battle of Gettysburg. In short, he stated that the Union generals were simply more “aggressive and active”⁵¹ than their counterparts. These generals had either fought a hard fight the day before, or in some cases had moved several miles to get to the fight. FM 6-22 implies the importance of stamina when it identifies the importance of “a leader with presence” and someone who possesses bearing, physical fitness, who is resilient, and composed and confident in the face of adversity. Army leadership identified this necessity in the 2006 Army Posture Statement (APS). The APS described the need to develop a new breed of officer, the

"pentathlete" who is a leader, combat soldier, statesman and sociologist.⁵² To be all these things, at one time, requires the greatest degree of mental and physical stamina, but they are often viewed as contradictions to current perceptions of manager-leaders.

Social intelligence (SI) characteristics are often touted as lack-luster in manager type positions, but there is no evidence to support this.⁵³ The manager-leader should convey SI competencies, which includes openness, altruism, agreeableness, and emotional stability. It becomes obvious why this particular quality is vital when considering the cultural environment within which Army officers work. The person who is open typically invites diverse opinions and therefore receives a wide range of courses of action for consideration, especially if the manager-leader displays empathy for others. Other advantages are that this person is typically a planner and shows due caution in risky environments. He is less likely to act spontaneously while maintaining an achievement oriented personality which is essential in overcoming challenges⁵⁴ in volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous, or VUCA, situations. Another quality of SI is altruism, which is characteristic of a person who possesses unselfish concern for the welfare of those in his or her charge. FM 6-22 identifies Army leaders as those who have empathy and care enough about the organization to devote time in the development of others.⁵⁵ Another quality of SI is agreeableness, which is a trait that provides advantages that are vital to strategic leaders who work with other cultures, the media, and other services and organizations. The agreeable person is described as a person who is "compassionate and cooperative rather than suspicious and antagonistic towards others."⁵⁶ A related quality of SI is one who possesses emotional stability, which is a person who tends to be controlled under stressful and complex situations.

The calm reaction to challenges often times produces a positive environment where people are more effective and moral is high. These people are normally predictable in their behavior and moods, which allows for subordinates and all other contacts to operate with an understanding of what the senior leader wants or needs to make decisions.

The final aspect of the manager-leader role is mental agility. This capacity is usually attributed to leaders, and managers are often criticized as lacking creativity or the ability to create new ideas and having flexibility in planning and execution. However, there is no reason to doubt a manager-leader can develop this area because it not a new concept. Studies as far back as the 1930's have reinforced the necessity for managers to have this ability.⁵⁷ And as Gary Willis points out, "It is accepted that Napoleon defeated his enemies because he was one of the few that understood that *Friktion* and *Wechselwirkung* were always at play."⁵⁸

Conclusion

The 21st century operational environment is fraught with complexity and quickly changing conditions that are conducted with and among people of diverse backgrounds. This requires future leaders to understand themselves and how their leadership must adapt to a variety of situations. To accomplish this, Army leaders cannot get stuck in a single way of understanding how leadership is employed and perceived by others. Therefore, it is helpful to understand how the Army's philosophy has emerged, what past theories influence current thinking, and apply new techniques where there is room for improvement.

This paper has argued that the U.S. Army is adept at learning and employing the most current understanding of what it takes to be a good and effective leader.

Throughout the last several decades, as modern social sciences have advanced leadership theories, the Army has consistently been at the forefront of employment of the latest practices. One only has to review FM 6-22 to find that nearly every major leadership theme of the past eighty years is represented. However, information about this topic is vast and sometimes overwhelms leaders of all ages. The Army's manual on leadership provides specific guidance and examples of attributes and behaviors, but does not provide a field of study to assist with the general knowledge and competencies an officer should possess, such as "business administration" for the typical business person. One can argue that Army officers are first managers and by becoming competent in this role (along with specific skills required by branch), they will become more competent leaders. Presently, the Army does not provide anything like what is offered in America's colleges for business, such as an "Army administration" field of study. It is doubtful this will ever happen, however, the individual officer can still acquire many of these skills through advanced education.

An officer should approach leadership with the understanding that such things as personality, physical appearance, and charisma alone will not in themselves be sufficient for effective leadership. One should be clear on roles and how to be skillful in one's role in order to gain the respect of others. This approach will lead to the emergence of leaders who can influence beyond their chain of command.⁵⁹ Along these lines, the role of manager-leader should be understood in order to clarify the tasks and skills needed to be an effective Army leader. By embracing this concept, the mystery of

leadership can be unveiled and the average person can train and educate him or herself in the art and science of the Army officer profession and develop into an effective leader.

Endnotes

¹ Robert C. Tucker, *Politics and Leadership* (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1981), 87.

² Sun Tzu, *The Art of War*, <http://suntzusaid.com/book/2> (accessed October 24, 2010).

³ Bernard M. Bass, *Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications*, 3rd ed. (New York, NY: The Free Press, 1990). This number includes what was cited in volume three, which was published in 1990. To be sure, many more theories have emerged since then.

⁴ David Kay, "Emerging Global Trends and Potential Implications for National Security," *National Security Watch*, NSW 09-1, (May 2009), http://www3.ausa.org/marketing/NSW_Trends_May09.pdf (accessed October 24, 2010).

⁵ The U.S. Army TRADOC web page, "A Leader Development Strategy for a 21st Century Army," <http://www.army.mil/-news/2009/12/09/31552-new-army-leader-development-strategy-released> (accessed on December 2, 2010).

⁶ Gary Wills, *Certain Trumpets: The Call of Leaders* (New York, NY: Simon and Schuster, 1994), 12.

⁷ Richard D. Lewis, *When Cultures Collide: Leading Across Cultures* (Boston, MA: Nicholas Brealey Publishing, 2006), 104.

⁸ Ibid., 107.

⁹ Bass, *Handbook of Leadership*, 9.

¹⁰ U.S. Department of the Army, *Army Leadership*, Field Manual 6-22 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army, November 2010), 1-1.

¹¹ Credit Research Foundation, Glossary of Terms, www.crfonline.org/orc/glossary/m.html, (accessed December 13, 2010).

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Michele Doyle and Mark Smith, "Born and Bred?," April 1999, http://www.infed.org/leadership/traditional_leadership.htm (accessed September 12, 2010).

¹⁴ John van Maurik, *Writers on Leadership* (New York, NY: Penguin Books, 2001), 3.

¹⁵ Bass, *Handbook of Leadership*, 38.

¹⁶ R. D. Mann, "A review of the relationship between personality and performance in small groups," *Psychological Bulletin* 66(4) (1959): 241-270.

¹⁷ Peter L. Wright, *Managerial Leadership* (New York, NY: Routledge, 1996), 35.

¹⁸ Doyle and Smith, "Born and Bred?"

¹⁹ Wright, *Managerial Leadership*, 35.

²⁰ Doyle and Smith, "Born and Bred?"

²¹ Bass, *Handbook of Leadership*, 48.

²² Ibid.

²³ Doyle and Smith, "Born and Bred?"

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ FM 6-22, 1-2, B-8.

²⁶ TRADOC, "A Leader Development Strategy for a 21st Century Army."

²⁷ Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal, *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership*, 3rd ed. (San Francisco, CA: John Wiley and Sons, 1997), 314.

²⁸ Ibid., 7-4.

²⁹ FM 6-22, 2-4.

³⁰ Bass, *Handbook of Leadership*, 25.

³¹ Elliott Jaques and Stephen D. Clement, *Executive Leadership: A Practical Guide to Managing Complexity* (Arlington, VA: Cason Hall Publishers, 1991), 15.

³² Wright, *Managerial Leadership*, 221.

³³ Jeff Fenlason, "Fen's Thoughts," <http://www.fensthoughts.blogspot.com/> (accessed September 15, 2010).

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ FM 6-22. References made throughout the manual.

³⁶ Jaques and Clement, *Executive Leadership*, 17.

³⁷ Ibid., xxv.

³⁸ Ibid., 19.

³⁹ Ibid., 15.

⁴⁰ Bass, *Handbook of Leadership*, 185.

⁴¹ Jaques and Clement, *Executive Leadership*, 17.

⁴² Ibid., 5.

⁴³ U.S. Department of the Army, *The Army, Field Manual 1* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army, June 2005), <http://www.army.mil/fm1/chapter1.html#section5> (accessed on October 5, 2010)

⁴⁴ Stephen J. Zaccaro, *Model and Theories of Executive Leadership: A Conceptual/Empirical Review and Integration* (Washington, DC: U.S. Army Research Institute, 1996), 128.

⁴⁵ Martin Chemers, "Leadership, Change, and Organizational Effectiveness," http://www.almaden.ibm.com/coevolution/pdf/chemers_paper.pdf (accessed October 13, 2010).

⁴⁶ Howard Gardner, *Leading Minds: An Anatomy of Leadership* (New York, NY: Harper Collins Publishers, 1996), 5.

⁴⁷ Warren Bennis, *On Becoming a Leader: The Leadership Classic*, 2nd ed. (New York, NY: Perseus Books Group, 2003), 39-40.

⁴⁸ FM 6-22, A-1.

⁴⁹ Encarta World English Dictionary (New York, NY: Bloomsbury Publishing, 1998-2007).

⁵⁰ Montgomery C. Meigs, "Generalship: Qualities, Instincts, and Character," *Parameters*, (Summer 2001): 4-17.

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² U.S. Department of the Army, *2006 Posture Statement* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army, February 10, 2006), <http://www.army.mil/aps/06/> (accessed October 13, 2010).

⁵³ Jaques and Clement, *Executive Leadership*, 21.

⁵⁴ Scott T. Rabideau, "Effects of Achievement Motivation on Behavior," Rochester Institute of Technology, <http://www.personalityresearch.org/papers/rabideau.html> (accessed October 13, 2010).

⁵⁵ FM 6-22, A-1.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Bass, *Handbook of Leadership*, 66.

⁵⁸ Wills, *Certain Trumpets*, 87.

⁵⁹ FM 6-22, 3-11.

